

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-4, 7-44, 46-48, 50-53, 55-56, 58, and 79 are pending in the application, with 1, 44 and 79 being the independent claims. Claims 5, 6, 45, 49, 54, 57 and 59-78 are sought to be cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. Claim 79 is sought to be added. Claims 1 and 44 are sought to be amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 31, 44, 45, 48, 77 and 78 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Paff (U.S. Patent No. 5,164,827). Claims 3, 5, 9, 37, 46, and 47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paff. Claims 10-16, 32-36 and 69 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paff in view of Heidmann *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,057,833). Claims 17-28, 49-51, 54-56, 70-72, 74 and 75 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paff in view of Kanade *et al.* (U.S. Patent App. No. 2002/0118286). Claims 38-43, 52 and 53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paff in view of Anderson (U.S. Patent No. 5,714,997).

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to include the elements of dependent claims 5 and 6. Applicants have also amended independent claim 44 to

include the steps of dependent claims 45, 49, 54 and 57. The Examiner indicated that dependent claims 6, 29, 30, 57 and 58 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. New independent claim 79 is dependent claim 29 written in independent form. Claims 70-78 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 1-4, 7-44, 46-48, 50-53, 55-56, 58 and 79 are in condition for allowance.

The amendments to claims 1 and 44 should not be construed as an admission that the Examiner's rejections are correct. Applicants have made the above amendments solely to expedite prosecution. Accordingly, Applicants reserve the right to file broader and/or different claims in a continuation application.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Robert Sokohl
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 36,013

Date: April 6, 2006

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

511460_1.DOC